Vote No. 350

August 2, 1995, 12:22 p.m. Page S-11153 Temp. Record

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION/Front-Line ABM Defense

SUBJECT: National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1996 . . . S. 1026. Nunn modified perfecting amendment No. 2078 to the Kyl/Inhofe amendment No. 2077.

ACTION: AMENDMENT AGREED TO, 98-1

SYNOPSIS: As reported, S. 1026, the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1996, will authorize \$264.7 billion in total budget authority for the Department of Defense, national security programs of the Department of Energy, civil defense, and military construction accounts. This amount is \$7 billion more than requested (\$5.3 billion more in procurement and \$1.7 billion more for research and development), and is \$2.6 billion less than the amount approved in the House-passed bill.

The Kyl/Inhofe amendment would express the sense of the Senate "that all Americans should be protected from accidental, intentional, or limited ballistic missile attack." The amendment is based on 12 findings, including:

- 5 nations have declared they have nuclear weapons and at least 20 other nations either unofficially have weapons of mass destruction and the means of delivering them or are attempting to gain those weapons and delivery systems;
 - North Korea has a ballistic missile which can reach Alaska, Hawaii, and Guam;
- Several countries recognize that weapons of mass destruction and missiles increase their ability to deter, coerce, or otherwise threaten the United States;
- the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and similar treaties are not sufficient to stop the spread of weapons of mass destruction; and
 - the end of the Cold War has changed the strategic environment between the United States and Russia.

The Nunn modified perfecting amendment to the Kyl amendment would add that it is also the sense of the Senate "that front-line troops of the United States armed forces should be protected from missile attacks." Further, the amendment would authorize \$35 million of the \$3.403 billion authorized for missile defenses to be used for the Marine Corps' SAM/MEAD front-line theater missile defense program. A portion of that \$35 million would be used for a study to determine whether a Theater Missile Defense system derived from Patriot missile defense technologies could fulfill the SAM/MEADS requirements at a lower estimated lifecycle

(See other side) **YEAS (98)** NAYS (1) NOT VOTING (1) Republicans **Democrats Democrats** Republican Republicans Democrats (52 or 98%) (46 or 100%) (1 or 2%) (0 or 0%)**(1)** (0)DeWine-2 Abraham Inhofe Akaka Brown Inouve Ashcroft Jeffords Baucus Johnston Kassebaum Biden Kennedy Bennett Bond Kempthorne Bingaman Kerrey Burns Kyl Boxer Kerry Campbell Lott Bradley Kohl Chafee Lugar Breaux Lautenberg Coats Mack Bryan Leahy Cochran Bumpers McCain Levin McConnell Cohen Lieberman Bvrd Coverdell Murkowski Conrad Mikulski Nickles Moseley-Braun Craig Daschle Moynihan D'Amato Packwood Dodd Dole Pressler Dorgan Murray Domenici Roth Exon Nıınn Feingold Faircloth Santorum Pell EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE: Frist Shelby Feinstein Pryor Gorton Simpson Ford Reid 1—Official Buisiness Gramm Smith Glenn Robb 2—Necessarily Absent Graham Rockefeller Grams Snowe 3—Illness Grassley Specter Harkin Sarbanes 4—Other Simon Gregg Stevens Heflin Hollings Wellstone Hatch Thomas SYMBOLS: Hatfield Thompson AY—Announced Yea Helms Thurmond AN-Announced Nav Hutchison Warner PY-Paired Yea PN-Paired Nay

VOTE NO. 350 AUGUST 2, 1995

cost than the estimated cost for the U.S. portion of the SAM/MEADS program (European allies have committed to paying half the costs of the SAM/MEADS program). The Secretary of Defense would submit a report on this study no later than March 1, 1996. No more than \$10 million of the \$35 million authorized could be spent before the submission of the report.

Those favoring the amendment contended:

The Nunn amendment would restore funding for the Corps SAM front-line theater missile defense program, which is also known as the MEADS program. This program is a cooperative program that is supported by the governments of Germany, France, and Italy. These governments have promised to pay approximately 50 percent of the costs, which eventually will total \$10 billion. We recognize that this program is expensive, but so are the four theater missile defense programs which are authorized in this bill. We have no problem with those four systems, except that they provide redundant coverage for rear and middle areas of a battlefield, but they provide no protection for frontline troops. Currently the only system under development that is designed specifically for frontline protection is the SAM/MEADS program. Further, the only existing protection for our forward troops are Hawk batteries, which are used against aircraft, cruise missiles, and ballistic missiles. The technology used in these batteries is dated, and not very effective against missiles. Some Senators have suggested that the Patriot PAC-3 technologies could be used to make a mobile missile defense system for frontline theater defense that would be as effective and cheaper than building the SAM/MEADS system. However, this bill does not provide any funding to make the PAC-3 mobile. Accordingly, this amendment would provide for a feasibility study. If it turns out that it is a better idea to develop a defense based on the PAC-3, we will join our colleagues in advocating that development. Our main interest in offering this amendment is not to favor one system over another, but to make certain that we provide the best possible protection to our troops in battle. The theater missile defense plan outlined in this bill has a glaring defect--protection will only be provided to the middle and rear echelons. The Nunn amendment would correct that defect, and therefore merits our support.

While favoring the amendment, some Senators expresseed the following reservations:

The Corps SAM system has been plagued by problems. If its funding is continued, Senators should be aware that it will cost an estimated \$10 billion to develop. We are aware that the Europeans have expressed an interest in paying half the development costs, but we do not have a binding commitment in hand. Additionally, Senators should know that advances in the Patriot missile defense system may make it capable of performing the theater missile defense functions that would be performed by the SAM system. Basically, we are willing to move forward cautiously. As this amendment has been modified, the first use of this money will be to conduct a study to see if we should develop Patriot technologies further instead of developing the SAM system. This approach is acceptable, so we will vote in favor of this amendment.

No arguments were expressed in opposition to the amendment.